

The court has conducted a *de novo* review of the petitioner's objections in relation to the pleadings and the applicable law. After careful consideration, the court is of the opinion the objections are without merit. The authorities cited in the Report and Recommendation establish that as petitioner is not eligible for release on mandatory supervision, the sanction imposed following his disciplinary conviction did not implicate a protected liberty interest. In his objections, petitioner asserts he has a protected liberty interest because of his disciplinary conviction's potential effect on the direct appeal of his criminal conviction. However, the fact

that petitioner was convicted for violating institutional rules would not be relevant to the issues raised by a direct appeal of his criminal conviction.

ORDER

Accordingly, the objections filed by petitioner (#7) are **OVERRULED**. The findings of fact and conclusions of law of the magistrate judge are correct and the report of the magistrate judge (#6) is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be entered denying the petition.

Furthermore, petitioner is not entitled to the issuance of a certificate of appealability. An appeal from a final judgment denying habeas relief may not proceed unless a certificate of appealability is issued. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253. The standard for a certificate of appealability requires the petitioner to make a substantial showing of the denial of a federal constitutional right. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). To make a substantial showing, the petitioner need not establish that he would prevail on the merits. Rather, he must demonstrate that the issues he raised are subject to debate among jurists of reason, that a court could resolve the issues in a different manner, or that the questions presented are worthy of encouragement to proceed further. *See Slack*, 529 U.S. at 483-84. Any doubt regarding whether to grant a certificate of appealability should be resolved in favor of the petitioner. *See Miller v. Johnson*, 200 F.3d 274, 280-81 (5th Cir. 2000).

Petitioner has not shown that the issue of whether his petition is meritorious is subject to debate among jurists of reason. The factual and legal questions raised by petitioner have been consistently resolved adversely to his position and the questions presented are not worthy of encouragement to proceed further. Petitioner has failed to make a sufficient showing to merit the issuance of a certificate of appealability. Thus, a certificate of appealability will not be issued.

SIGNED at Beaumont, Texas, this 17th day of January, 2024.



MARCIA A. CRONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE